

Knobbe Martens Olson & Bear LLP

Intellectual Property Law

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**2040 Main Street
Fourteenth Floor
Irvine, CA 92614
Tel 949-760-0404
Fax 949-760-9502
www.kmrob.com

JAN 18 2008

Facsimile Transmittal Sheet

ORIGINAL WILL NOT FOLLOW

Confidentiality Notice:

The documents accompanying this facsimile transmission contain confidential information which may be legally privileged. The information is intended only for the use of the recipient named below. If you have received this facsimile in error, please immediately notify us by telephone to arrange for return of the original documents to us; and any disclosure, copying, distribution or the taking of any action in reliance on the contents of this faxed information is strictly prohibited.

TO: Examiner Brent S. Stace
USPTO FACSIMILE NO.: 571/ 273-8372 (and 8300)
USPTO REFERENCE: Applicant: Beck
Serial No.: 10/619,938
Filed: July 15, 2003
OPERATOR: Kathy Collins for Ted Cannon
ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.: EXP.025A
TOTAL PAGES: 2 (INCLUDING COVER SHEET)
DATE: January 18, 2008

IF YOU DID NOT RECEIVE ALL OF THE PAGES, PLEASE CALL BACK IMMEDIATELY.

Facsimile Operator Phone Number: (949) 760-0404

Direct Line to Machine: (949) 760-9502

MESSAGE: *Attached is a copy of a Proposed Interview Agenda for your meeting with Bill Bunker on Tuesday, January 22nd at 10:00am.*

San Diego
619-235-8550San Francisco
415-954-4114Los Angeles
310-551-3450Riverside
951-781-9231San Luis Obispo
805-547-5580Washington, DC
202-640-6400

**RECEIVED
CENTRAL FAX CENTER**

JAN 18 2008

**Application No. 10/619,938
Filed July 15, 2003**

INTERACTIVE ONLINE RESEARCH SYSTEM AND METHOD

PROPOSED INTERVIEW AGENDA

Date/Time: January 22, 2008 at 10:00 am

Type: Personal

Attendees: Examiner Stace and Bill Bunker of Knobbe, Martens, Olson & Bear, LLP

I. DISCUSSION OF DISTINCTIONS OF ONE EMBODIMENT OF THE APPLICANTS' SYSTEM FROM THE RUPPELT PATENT

The Applicants believe that at least one embodiment in the application is distinguishable from the system of the Ruppelt patent. The focus of the Ruppelt patent is to guide a user through troubleshooting questions in order to diagnose and fix a problem. In contrast, one embodiment of the Applicants' system induces a user of a more general purpose website (such as a portal like Yahoo!) to answer survey questions that aid the marketing system to tailor advertisements to the user. The Applicants believe that this embodiment is conceptually different from the Ruppelt patent and desire to reach agreement with the Examiner about specific differences that will satisfy the Examiner that the Applicants' system is patentable.

II. DISCUSSION OF CLAIM AMENDMENTS

The Applicants are prepared to amend the claims to explicitly define patentable distinctions. The Applicants will propose various claim amendments that are believed to distinguish one embodiment of the Applicants' system from the Ruppelt patent. The Applicants also welcome a discussion of any claim amendments proposed by the Examiner. The Applicants desire to reach agreement with the Examiner about specific claim amendments that will overcome the Examiner's rejection of the claims in view of the Ruppelt patent. If such an agreement is reached, the Applicants will amend the claims in a formal written response with the understanding that the Examiner will conduct a supplemental search.

4772824